

T. ADAMIK

### TEXTLINGUISTICS AND RHETORICAL TRADITION IN THE RHETORICA AD HERENNIIUM

1. In antiquity rhetoric performed all those tasks that today are expected to be performed by grammar that is rhetoric prepared the young people to life, to the socially useful public service. Thus, the stressing of the unity of life and school is not a discovery of our age: its importance was emphasised in every period, in which the questions of education were taken earnestly. In the preface of the rhetoric addressed to Herennius we can read as follows: "Theory without continuous practice in speaking is of little avail; . . . the precepts of theory here offered ought to be applied in practice."<sup>1</sup> One thousand years later Johannes Saresberiensis in the introduction of his great work written in defence of logic explains his idea as follows: "all such philosophical education is useless and false that does not foster virtue and does not serve life."<sup>2</sup>

Antique rhetoric which, built on grammar, formed the material of higher education was a rather complex branch of science. It comprised many branches of knowledge beginning with philosophy, through law, psychology, logic, and history, to stylistics. Still, if I want to express its essence with one word, I would call it textual science. In fact, it placed each branch of knowledge enumerated in the service of the creation of text that is it kept in view the textual units larger than a sentence. Besides this, it always examined the text, the speech, within the process of communication. Aristotle in Book I of his Rhetoric defines speech as follows: "In fact speech consists of three factors, *viz.*: the speaker, of what he speaks, and to whom he speaks, and I believe the aim of the speech is directed to the latter that is to the listener".<sup>3</sup> From these two general characteristics follows the third one, *viz.* the stressing of functionality.

Of course, the modern works dealing with textual science — even if not with a proper emphasis —, but refer to the relations of textual science to antique rhetoric. According to Bernd Spillner the works of belles-letters were also inspired with antique rhetoric. "This effect could be achieved by rhetoric — Spillner writes —, because it gave systematically built directives to textual creation with the inclusion of a large number of models of drafting and argumentation."<sup>4</sup> Wolfgang Dressler regards rhe-

torics as one of the precursors of textlinguistics: "Of the important tasks of the orator, two belong to the field of textlinguistics (at least partly): the arrangement of the say, the disposition and the linguistic formation, the elocution."<sup>5</sup> S. János Petőfi and his co-authors among the initiatives disclosing the regularities of the narrative attribute a significant role to Aristotle: "The first important step in the examination of the narrative structures ... is undoubtedly meant by the Poetics of Aristotle. ... Aristotle starts out from the conception that: a more composite structure arises from a more simple structure so that first a general scheme is formed, and then this general scheme is expanded with the inclusion of further episodes. This general scheme that could be called the summing up of the content, is called by us the plot of the narrative."<sup>6</sup>

2. According to Sigfried Schmidt we can speak about the exactness of the science of literature only if we regard the work of art as a complex of meanings, as something that has come about as a result of wording processes. These processes can be grasped on the basis of the following principle: "Keine Bedeutung (spezieller: keine Innovation) ohne Rekurrenz (bzw. Strukturbasis)".<sup>7</sup> It was just this recognition that, according to tradition, brought about the rhetorical theory. In 467 B.C. the tyrants were driven away in Sicily, and democracy came into existence. The consequence of this was in public life that everybody could seek his truth freely.<sup>8</sup> This, however, increased the law suits so much that their conduction with the traditional methods seemed to be impossible. At this time a man named Corax elaborated such a structure of speech, with which argumentation could be made briefly, and still convincingly. This efficient structure of speech is divided into three parts, *viz.*: introduction, narration and conclusion. The pupil of Corax, Tisias added to the above three parts also a fourth, after the narration he inserted the argumentation. And when democracy was brought about also in Athens, Gorgias of Leontini who about this time (427 B.C.) was envoy in Athens, brought along with him from his country the great invention of the Sicilians, where in the course of time rhetoric developed into a separate *techné*, which became a worthy companion of dialectics.<sup>9</sup>

Hereafter I do not speak about rhetorics in general terms but I draw up the relations of a single rhetoric to textual science, of the so called rhetoric addressed to Herennius. It has a double reason why I have chosen exactly this among the several antique works to be taken into account. Firstly: the rhetoric addressed to Herennius, which reflects the traditions of school education, came about in the 80s B.C., thus Cicero, Caesar, Lucretius and Catullus could learn from similar text-books.<sup>10</sup> Secondly: this rhetoric was a text-book for several centuries also in medieval Hungary, just like everywhere in Western Europe. The part on rhetorics of the students' lecture notes from the 12th century known as the "codex of Esztergom", is an abstract of the rhetoric addressed to Herennius.<sup>11</sup>

The rhetoric addressed to Herennius gives such a system of rules into the hands of the orator, with the help of which any speech can be compiled. Just like most antique rhetorics, also the one discussed by us approaches



the process of compilation of a speech from two sides, *viz.* on the one hand from the side of the tasks of the orator, and on the other hand from the side of the parts of speech. In order to have a speech ready to be delivered, the orator had to perform the following tasks, *viz.*: 1. the collection of material (*inventio*), 2. the collected material had to be arranged (*dispositio*), 3. the material arranged this way had to be put in a proper form (*elocutio*), 4. the way recital of the speech had to be elaborated (*pronunciatio*), 5. and finally the ready speech had to be learnt by heart in accordance with the way of recital chosen. The part discussed by the rhetoric chosen by us under the entry-word *memoria*, renders help to this work.<sup>12</sup>

The *inventio* is the most difficult and most complex task of the orator: all the others depend on it. The range of tasks of the *inventio* comprised the definition of the kind of the case that could be judicial, deliberative, epideictic;<sup>13</sup> the definition of the character of the case: whether it is honourable, discreditable, doubtful, and petty.<sup>14</sup> In the case of judicial affairs the state of the matter had to be established that is from what the dispute originates, *viz.*: whether the type of issue is conjectural, legal, and juridical.<sup>15</sup> After the decision of this the motive of defence, and then the main argument of the accusation had to be sought, and the correct judgement was found with the collation of the two.<sup>16</sup> If the judgement was made, then the speech had to be prepared, the aim of which was to have the judgement accepted also by others that is the whole weight of the speech was directed to the judgement. This is the focus of the speech, the cohesion that – according to the words of Zoltán Szabó – “amalgamates the different constituents of the speech”,<sup>17</sup> that global content that the speech expounds, proves and makes accepted by the audience. Thus, the statement of Dressler is not founded, according to which only two of the tasks of the antique orator are connected with textlinguistics, *viz.* the arrangement and the style, since not only these two tasks but also all the others depend on the invention.

After the orator has found the judgement in the course of the *inventio*, his second task will be to put his sentences into a proper order. The rhetoric addressed to Herennius deals in greater detail with the *dispositio*, than the earlier works and gives the parts of the speech in a more shaded form. It does not accept only four parts like Aristotle, but six parts, *viz.*: introduction, narraton, division, argumentation, refutation and conclusion.<sup>18</sup>

The character of the *introduction* is determined by the sort and nature of the case to be discussed. Depending on this two kinds of introduction can be applied, *viz.*: direct or indirect. “The Direct Opening straightway prepares the hearer to attend to our speech. Its purpose is to enable us to have hearers who are attentive, receptive, and well-disposed. If our cause is of the doubtful kind, we shall build the Direct Opening upon goodwill, so that the discreditable part of the cause cannot be prejudicial to us. If our cause is of the petty kind, we shall make our hearers attentive. If our cause is of the discreditable kind, . . . we must use the Subtle Approach, . . .”<sup>19</sup> It is illuminating what it says about insinuation, because from this it becomes clear that at the compilation of the introduction we must consider

not only the nature of the case, but also the circumstances of the delivery of the speech: "There are three occasions on which we cannot use the Direct Opening, and these we must consider carefully: (1) when our cause is discreditable, that is, when the subject itself alienates the hearer from us; (2) when the hearer has apparently been won over by the previous speaker of the opposition; (3) or when the hearer has become wearied by listening to the previous speakers."<sup>20</sup>

The *narration* has three varieties, viz.: acquainting with the facts of the case, arousing confidence or suspicion, and character-drawing. Its requirements are brevity, clearness and reality. "We shall be able to make the Statement of Facts brief if we begin it at the place at which we need to begin; if we do not try to recount from the remotest beginning; . . ." We draw up the case clearly, if we say earlier what happened earlier, that is, if we keep in the recital of the events that chronological order in which they took place or could take place.<sup>21</sup> "Our Statement of Facts will have plausibility . . . if account is strictly kept of the length of time, the standing of the persons involved, the motives in the planning, and the advantages offered by the scene of action, so as to obviate the argument in refutation that the time was too short, or that there was no motive, or that the place was unsuitable, or that the persons themselves could not have acted or been treated so."<sup>22</sup>

The *division* is essentially the outline of the case, the statement of those points in which we agree with the adversaries, and of those about which we argue. Then we give an enumeration, and we expound briefly the certain points. We do all this to make clear what is our opinion, what we want to prove and what we want to refute.<sup>23</sup>

The importance of the *argumentation* is also specially emphasised and discussed in rather detail by the rhetoric. The most complete and most perfect is that *argument which consists of five parts, viz.:* the proposition, the reason, the proof of the reason, the embellishment and the résumé.<sup>24</sup> This argumentation is identical with the Greek *epicheirema*, with that rhetorical syllogism that is more perfect than the enthymema, the simple rhetorical syllogism. Aristotle's enthymema consists of one or two premisses and one conclusion, and the *epicheirema* consists of four premisses. Aristotle regarded the premisses as proved, while the later rhetors proved also these, and this is how that fivefold evidence came into existence that is held by the rhetoric discussed by us most perfect.<sup>25</sup> Of course, it is not compulsory to apply always this fivefold evidence, we can simplify depending on the character of the case.<sup>26</sup>

Hereafter the rhetoric discussed examines, what errors can be made in the argumentation, in the reasoning.<sup>27</sup> These faults must be known in order that, on the one hand, also we ourselves can avoid them, and on the other hand that if the adversary will commit them, we could refute him with his own negligence. In the expounding of the proposition of the argumentation the rhetoric draws the attention to five faults. For example that proposition is defective, in which about something that occurs seldom we maintain that it is never possible, thus: "No one can fall in love at a



single glance, or as he is passing by."<sup>28</sup> Because it can occur that one falls in love at the first glance. In the reason of the proposition we must also take care of five faults. For example the reason is defective if it is based on false argumentation, thus: "One must not flee from love, for it engenders the truest friendship."<sup>29</sup> The author of the rhetoric pays great attention to the proving of the reason: he enumerates twenty faults to be avoided. For example the proving of the reason is defective, if something that could mean several things, is limited to one thing, thus: "She must have become a mother, since she is holding a baby boy in her arms."<sup>30</sup> In connection with the embellishment of the argumentation he again mentions five faults. For example it is a fault to embellish something that still has to be proved,<sup>31</sup> etc.

The last part of the speech, the *conclusion consists of three parts, viz.:* summing up, amplification and appeal to pity. The aim of the summing up is to briefly recall the main points of the whole speech in order that everybody can see, what are the facts of the case and why is the decision justified. The amplification (intensification) is applied in order to have an effect on the hearers with the help of the so called commonplaces or general arguments (*loci communes*).<sup>32</sup> The aim of the appeal to pity is to win the sympathy of the hearers and the judges. This can be achieved in several ways, for example if we tell how sad childhood we had, if we confess that by those disasters that are involved in the losing of the law suit, what a serious trouble would come upon our parents or children, and we are anxious also for them.<sup>33</sup> "The Appeal to Pity must be brief, for nothing dries more quickly than a tear."<sup>34</sup>

3. After having determined the kind and character of the case, having found the judgement, and having built up the speech, we have to put the arranged material in a linguistic form. The *elocutio* renders help to this working process. The author of the rhetoric discusses the question of style in Book 4, whose size is almost as big as the previous three books together. In the rhetoric of Aristotle the style occupied still 12 chapters.<sup>35</sup> The detailed elaboration of the stylistic requirements was done by the theoreticians of the Hellenistic rhetoric, first of all by Theophrastus and Hermagoras. The rhetoric discussed by us reflects this phase of development.<sup>36</sup> Its source value is therefore invaluable, because as a result of the loss of the Greek works, it laid down first several stylistic phenomena brought about in the Hellenistic period. In this book the model texts written by the author mean peculiar dashes of colour. His opinion was namely that the author of rhetoric must be at home in the art of writing in such a degree that he has to illustrate the stylistic requirements made known by him with his own examples.<sup>37</sup>

He begins his theorems in connection with style with the theory of the three styles, and with the merits of the style efficient for the orator. The exposition of the theory of the three styles appears here for the first time in Graeco-Latin stylistic literature. The author stresses that the three styles, *viz.* the simple, the medium and the sublime style, have to be alternated in accordance with the parts of the speech and the say. For example

in the statement of the facts of the case the simple style, in the appeal to pity the grand (sumblime) style is applied. Another aim of the alternation of the stylistic elements is to avoid monotony.<sup>38</sup>

The style that suites the purposes of the orator best has three requirements, *viz.*: taste, artistic composition and distinction.<sup>39</sup> Taste is composed of two factors, *viz.* of correct Latinity and clarity.<sup>40</sup> This can be achieved by avoiding barbarisms and solecisms. "Artistic Composition consists in an arrangement which gives uniform finish to the discourse in every part."<sup>41</sup> The proper adornment renders the speech, on the one hand, ornate, and on the other hand, varied,<sup>42</sup> its characteristic means are the figures of words and thoughts.

The larger half of Book 4 is occupied by the discussion of the *figures of words and thoughts*. It is not the aim of the author of the rhetoric to separate the figures of words and thoughts accurately from each other, but to give a description of almost all methods of text drafting under these two entry-words. He discusses forty-three figures of words, these are as follows: epanaphora, antistrophe, interlacement, transplacement, antithesis, apostrophe, reasoning by question and answer, maxim, reasoning by contraries, colon, comma, period, isocolon, homoeoptoton, homoeoteleuton, paronomasia, hypophora, definition, transition, climax, correction, paralipsis, disjunction, conjunction, reduplication, interpretation, reciprocal change, surrender, indecision, elimination, asyndeton, aposiopesis, conclusion, onomatopoeia, antonomasia, metonymy, periphrasis, hyperbaton, hyperbole, synecdoche, catachresis, metaphor, allegory.<sup>43</sup>

The discussion of the certain figures consists of three parts, *viz.* definition, example and the giving of the function. For example: "Interlacement is the union of both figures, the combined use of the Antistrophe and Epanaphora, . . . we repeat both the first word and the last in a succession of phrases, as follows: Who are they who have often broken treaties? The Carthaginians. Who are they who have waged war with severest cruelty? The Carthaginians. Who are they who have marred the face of Italy? The Carthaginians. Who are they who now ask for pardon? The Carthaginians. See then how appropriate it is for them to gain their request."<sup>44</sup> To its function he adds the following remark: "This figure has not only much charm, but also impressiveness and vigour in highest degree; I therefore believe that it ought to be used for both the embellishment and the amplification of style." The interesting feature of these figures is that essentially they are text forming methods. This is the reason, why the illustrative examples of the author are so long; generally they tell a whole situation or series of thoughts, for example the reasoning<sup>45</sup> and its function.<sup>46</sup>

Among the 19 figures of thought<sup>47</sup> — distribution, frankness of speech, understatement, vivid description, division, accumulation, refining, dwelling on the point, antithesis, comparison, exemplification, simile, portrayal, character delineation, dialogue, personification, emphasis, conciseness, ocular demonstration — there are several such that could help the students even in the present-day teaching of composition to acquire a more tinged



ability of expression. For example on conciseness (*brevitas*) the author says as follows: "Conciseness is the expression of an idea by the very minimum of essential words, as follows: On his way he took Lemnus, then left a garrison at Thasus, after that destroyed the Bithynian city, Cius, next, returning to the Hellespont, he forthwith occupies Abydus."<sup>48</sup> He defines the function of brevity as follows: "Conciseness expresses a multitude of things within the limits of but a few words, and is therefore to be used often, either when the facts do not require a long discourse or when time will not permit dwelling upon them."<sup>49</sup>

The *expolitio*, the refining, renders possible a looser narration of the say of several kinds. The author defines it as follows: "Refining consists in dwelling on the same topic and yet seeming to say something ever new."<sup>50</sup> This can be achieved with three kinds of alternation: with the changing of the words, the way of recital and the elaboration. For example the idea that "the wise man shuns no danger for his country" is proposed by the author of the rhetoric to be told with the changing of the words in two ways as follows: a) "No peril is so great that a wise man would think it ought to be avoided when the safety of the fatherland is at stake," b) "When the lasting security of the state is in question, the man endowed with good principles will undoubtedly believe that in defence of the fortunes of the republic he ought to shun no crisis of life, and he will ever persist in the determination eagerly to enter, for the fatherland, any combat, however great the peril to life."<sup>51</sup> With the way of recital we change so that we recite the thought once in conversational style, and then passionately; and with elaboration so that once we draft in the form of making someone speak, and then in the form of encouraging. The possibility of variation is increased by the fact that all this can be recited with reason or without reason, or in the form of antithesis, comparison, exemplification, or conclusion. And to show the efficiency of the system of rules of rhetoric, the author presents the above idea still in seven varieties, for example in the form of comparison like this: "He who in a voyage prefers his own to his vessel's security, deserves contempt. No less blameworthy is he who in a crisis of the republic consults his own in preference to the common safety. For from the wreck of a ship many of those on board escape unharmed, but from the wreck of the fatherland no one can swim to safety."<sup>52</sup> He sums up the function of refining as follows: he has dealt with it in such a detailed form, because it is very important not only in pleading, "but it is by far our most important means of training for skill in style."<sup>53</sup>

4. Summing up the aspects of textual linguistics in the rhetoric discussed by us, the following facts are worth emphasising. — 1. It is obvious that in the age when this rhetoric came into existence, the typical structure of *oration* was divided into *six parts*, viz.: introduction, narration, argumentation, refutation and conclusion. The detailed discussion of the parts shows that the structure of speech stood at this time in the centre of rhetorical thinking. Essentially, all those want to solve a similar task, who disclose the more general structure of certain genres, as for example Lessing discloses that of the epigram,<sup>54</sup> Propp that of the magic tale,<sup>55</sup>

Károly Csúri<sup>56</sup> that of the "short story", van Dijk and his co-workers the "global structure" of the narrative.<sup>57</sup> The global structure of van Dijk and his co-workers is also therefore interesting, because it coincides with the parts of speech of the rhetoric discussed by us, *viz.*: the Einführung corresponds to the introduction, the Komplikation to the narration of the facts of the case, the Konfrontation to the division, the Konklusion to the conclusion. But also other elements tally, e.g. the agentes and patientes, the space and time, etc. — 2. In the rhetoric discussed by us an important role is played by the making of the opinion of the orator accepted, the argumentation and the effect. In textual science these questions are examined by pragmatism, it appears, however, as if the researchers would not pay proper attention to the results of antique rhetoric, for example Perelman, I. and W. Kummer, H. Verdaasdonk.<sup>58</sup> — 3. Tzvetan Todorov, stressing the timeliness of rhetoric, writes as follows: "regarding several essential aspects of language only rhetorical descriptions are available to us",<sup>59</sup> therefore these descriptions ought to be examined again with the application of the more recent viewpoints and methods. However, in Todorov's article there is such a statement that is worth to be discussed in a somewhat greater detail, *viz.*: "The rhetoricians, just like the grammarians of the classical age, believe that there exists a simple and natural way of speaking that does not require description — because it is self-evident. The subject of rhetoric is, what differs from this simple way of speaking. This latter, however, is not the subject of any other kind of meditation. Therefore, all knowledge furnished by the rhetoricians is a knowledge compared with something unknown."<sup>60</sup> The rhetoric addressed to Herennius carefully observes that no such fault should occur. When it defines the certain stylistic elements, illustrates and defines their function, it always states in comparison to what it makes its valuation. It definitely states that the grand style is not identical with the bombastic style standing near to it. It condemns the bombastic style not because it is bombastic, but because it is not appropriate to the subject, it uses more weighty words than required, or crude metaphors. On this condemnable style it mentions the following example: "For he who by high treason betrays his native land will not have paid a condign penalty albeit hurtl'd into gulfs Neptunian. So punish ye this man, who hath builded mounts of war, destroyed the plains of peace."<sup>61</sup> In connection with the simple style it illustrates with the same example<sup>62</sup> that style of speech, which is already no longer simple, but vulgar. It writes as follows: the speech of those who cannot realize this tasteful simplicity, will be dry and dull, for example: "Now this fellow came up to this lad in the bath. After that he says: 'Your slaveboy here has beat me.' After that the lad says to him: 'I'll think about it.' Afterwards this fellow called the lad names and shouted louder and louder, while a lot of people were there." "This language, to be sure, is mean and trifling, having missed the goal of the Simple type, which is speech composed of correct and well-chosen words."<sup>63</sup> The statement of Todorov is essentially related to what the handbooks used to call the stylistic conception of antique rhetoric, namely according to the aint-



ques the style is in the rhetorical elaboration, in the ornamentation. This is why the figures and tropes are so important for them.

Several things could be mentioned to refute this statement,<sup>64</sup> but I believe it is sufficient if I quote the stylistic definition of the rhetoric discussed by me: "Style is the adaptation of suitable words and sentences to the matter devised."<sup>65</sup> Thus, not the ornamentation is the essence of style, but that it should be adjusted to the subject.

5. In conclusion I should like to draw *three lessons* of more general nature. a) It is not worth while to oppose traditional and modern linguistics to each other so sharply, because it is a uniform process; it must be regarded as natural that today the linguistic phenomena are seen from different viewpoints than by the ancients. Exactly that would be strange, if it were not like this. This, however, does not excuse us from not knowing the results of the ancients, since many of our ideas regarded as modern can be traced back to antique antecedents.<sup>66</sup> — b) Today one should no longer speak about antique rhetoric in general terms. The certain rhetorics should be examined separately, not only because they have come about in different social realities, but also because each one intended to solve different theoretical and practical tasks. It can be taken for sure that Aristotle was governed by other viewpoints than the author of the rhetoric discussed by us, and similarly Quintilian was governed by other viewpoints than Saint Augustine, who in his rhetoric known under the title *De doctrina christiana* laid down the foundations of semiology. It is true that the concept of the sign had been known also earlier, but for its more detailed elaboration there was no social demand. This demand showed itself with a greater coercive force, when the interpretation of the Bible came into the centre of Christian science. — c) It must be regarded as justified that in the grammar of our days interest has awakened towards the linguistic units larger than the sentence, since after all these — even if from different viewpoints and with different methods — have always been examined in the framework of rhetoric, in antiquity just like in the Middle Ages.

<sup>1</sup> *artem sine adsiduitate dicendi non multum iuvare ... hanc rationem praeceptionis ad exercitationem adcommodari oportere* (I, 1. Marx) I quote the English text from the translation by H. Caplan. London, 1968<sup>3</sup>. (The Loeb Classical Library).

<sup>2</sup> *Est enim quaelibet professio philosophandi inutilis, et falsa, quae se ipsam in cultu virtutis, et vitae exhibitione non aperit* (Metalogicon, Prol.).

<sup>3</sup> Aristotle: *Rhetorica* I. 3.

<sup>4</sup> B. Spillner: *Linguistik und Literaturwissenschaft. Stilforschung, Rhetorik, Textlinguistik*. Stuttgart, 1974. 97: „Diesen Erfolg konnte die Rhetorik nur deshalb erzielen, weil sie eine systematisch aufgebaute Anleitung zur Textproduktion anbot, unter Einbeziehung umfangreicher Vertextungs- und Argumentations-schemata.“

<sup>5</sup> W. Dressler: Einführung in die Textlinguistik. Tübingen, 1972. 5: „Zwei wichtige Aufgaben des Redners fallen (zumindest teilweise) in den Bereich der Textlinguistik: die Anordnung der Gedanken oder Disposition und die sprachliche Formulierung oder Elokution.“

<sup>6</sup> T. A. van Dijk — J. Ihwe — S. J. Petäfi — H. Ricser: Zur Bestimmung narrativer Strukturen auf der Grundlage von Textgrammatiken. Hamburg, 1974<sup>2</sup>. 2: „Den ersten

wichtigen Schritt in der Geschichte der Untersuchung narrativer Strukturen ... stellt unzweifelhaft die Poetik von Aristoteles dar"; 4: Aristoteles geht nur davon aus, daß eine komplexere Struktur aus einer einfacheren Struktur dadurch entsteht, daß zunächst ein allgemeines Schema konstruiert und dann dieses allgemeine Schema durch das Einfügen von weiteren Episoden expandiert wird".

<sup>7</sup> S. Schmidt: Text und Bedeutung. Sprachphilosophische Prolegomena zu einer textsemantischen Literaturwissenschaft. In: Text, Bedeutung, Ästhetik. Ed. by S. J. Schmidt. München, 1970. 49, 51.

<sup>8</sup> G. Kennedy: The Art of Persuasion in Greece. London, 1963. 59–60.

<sup>9</sup> Arist.: Rhet. I. 1.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Incerti Auctoris de ratione dicendi Ad C. Herennium libri IV. Edidit F. Marx. Lipsiae, 1894. 153–56; Cornifici Rhetorica ad Herennium. A cura di G. Calboli. Bologna, 1969. 12–7.

<sup>11</sup> I. Mészáros: A XII. századi esztergomi diákjegyzet (The Students' Notes of Esztergom from the 12th Century). Budapest, 1973. Pedagógiai Múzeum 2. 19–27; 50–63.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. 3, 28–39.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. 1, 2.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. 1, 5.

<sup>15</sup> 1, 18–9, 24.

<sup>16</sup> 1, 25–6.

<sup>17</sup> Z. Szabó: A mai stílusztika nyelvelméleti alapjai (The Foundations of Linguistic Theory in Present-Day Stylistics). Kolozsvár-Napoca, 1977. 188–9.

<sup>18</sup> *Inventio in sex partes orationis consumitur: in exordium, narrationem, divisionem, confirmationem, confutationem, conclusionem* (I, 4).

<sup>19</sup> I, 6.

<sup>20</sup> 1, 9.

<sup>21</sup> 1, 14–15.

<sup>22</sup> *Veri similis narratio erit ... si spatia temporum, personarum dignitates, consiliorum rationes, locorum opportunitates constabunt, ne refelli possit aut temporis parum fuisse, aut causam nullam, aut locum idoneum non fuisse, aut homines ipsos facere aut pati non potuisse* (1, 16).

<sup>23</sup> 1, 16–7.

<sup>24</sup> *Ergo absolutissima et perfectissima est argumentatio ea, quae in quinque partes est distributa: propositionem, rationem, rationis confirmationem, exornationem, complexionem* (2, 28).

<sup>25</sup> G. Calboli: op. cit. 239–41.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. 2, 30.

<sup>27</sup> 2, 31–47.

<sup>28</sup> *Nemo potest uno aspectu neque praeteriens in amore incidi* (2, 33).

<sup>29</sup> *Amor fugiendus non est, nam ex eo verissima nascitur amicitia* (2, 35).

<sup>30</sup> *"Necesse est peperisse, quoniam sustinet puerum infantem"* (2, 39).

<sup>31</sup> 2, 46.

<sup>32</sup> It enumerates ten such commonplaces: 2, 48–9.

<sup>33</sup> 2, 50.

<sup>34</sup> *Commiserationem brevem esse oportet, nihil enim lacrima citius arescit* (2, 50).

<sup>35</sup> Arist.: Rhet. 3, 1–12.

<sup>36</sup> G. Kennedy: The art of rhetoric in the Roman world. Princeton, New Jersey, 1972. 111–137.

<sup>37</sup> Cf. 4, 1–10.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. 4, 11–6.

<sup>39</sup> *Quae maxime admodum oratori adcommodata est, tres res in se debet habere: elegantiam, compositionem, dignitatem* (4, 17).

<sup>40</sup> Cf. 4, 17.

<sup>41</sup> *Conpositio est verborum constructio, quae facit omnes partes orationis aequabiliter perpolitae* (4, 18).

<sup>42</sup> Cf. *Dignitas est, quae reddit ornatam orationem varietate distinguens* (4, 18).

<sup>43</sup> Cf. 4, 19–46.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. 4, 20.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. 4, 23.



<sup>46</sup> *Haec exornatio ad sermonem vehementer adcommodata est, et animum auditoris retinet adtentum cum venustate sermonis tum rationum expectatione* (4, 24).

<sup>47</sup> Cf. 4, 47–69.

<sup>48</sup> *Brevitas est res ipsis tantummodo verbis necessariis expedita, hoc modo: "Lemnum praeteriens cepit, inde Thasi praesidium reliquit, post urbem Viminacium sustulit, inde pulsus in Hellespontum statim potitur Abydi"* (4, 68).

<sup>49</sup> *Habet paucis comprehensa brevitas multarum rerum expeditionem. Quare adhibenda saepe est, cum aut res non egent longae orationis aut tempus non sinet commorari* (4, 68).

<sup>50</sup> *Expolitio est cum in eodem loco manemus et aliud atque aliud dicere videmur* (4, 54).

<sup>51</sup> 4, 54.

<sup>52</sup> 4, 57.

<sup>53</sup> *In his igitur generibus expolitio versatur; de qua producti sumus, ut plura diceremus, quod non modo, cum causam dicimus, adiuvat et exornat orationem, sed multo maxime per eum exercetur ad elocutionis facultatem* (4, 58).

<sup>54</sup> G. E. Lessing: *Über das Epigramm*. Gesammelte Werke. Berlin, 1956. 7. Bd. 7–52.

<sup>55</sup> V. J. Propp: *A mese morfológiája* (The Morphology of the Tale). Budapest, 1975.

<sup>56</sup> K. Csúri: *Egy narratív struktúratípus néhány szabályszerűsége* (Some Regularities of a Narrative Structure Type). *Általános Nyelvészeti Tanulmányok XI* (1976) 37–50.

<sup>57</sup> T. A. van Dijk–S. J. Petőfi–H. Ricser: op. cit. 19.

<sup>58</sup> I. and W. Kummer: *Logic of action and the structure of practical arguments. Pragmatics of Language and Literature*. Amsterdam, 1976. 83–105; H. Verdaasdonk: *Concepts of acceptance and the basis of a theory of texts*. I. m. 179–227. Cf. also Ch. Perelman–L. Olbrechts-Tyteca: *Traité de l'Argumentation*. La nouvelle rhétorique. Bruxelles, 1970<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>59</sup> T. Todorov: *Littérature et signification*. Paris, 1967. 91.

<sup>60</sup> T. Todorov: op. cit. 94.

<sup>61</sup> *"Nam qui perduellionibus vendit patriam, non satis subplicii dedit, si praeceps in Neptunias depulsus erit lacunas. Poenite igitur istum, qui montis belli fabricatus est, campos sustulit pacis"* (4, 15).

<sup>62</sup> *In adtenuato figurae genere, id quod ad infimum et cotidianum sermonem demissum est, hoc erit exemplum: "Nam ut forte hic in balneas venit, coepit, postquam perfusus est, defricari; deinde, ubi visum est, ut in alveum descenderet, ecce tibi iste de traverso: "Heus", inquit, "adolescens, pueri tui modo me pulsarunt; satis facias oportet". Hic, qui id aetatis ab ignoto praeter consuetudinem appellatus esset, erubuit. Iste clarius eadem et alia dicere coepit. Hic rix: "Tamen", inquit, "sine me considerare". Tum vero iste clamare voce ista, quae perfacile cuivis rubores eicere potest* (4, 14).

<sup>63</sup> *"Nam istic in balneis accessit ad hunc. Postea dixit: "Hic tuus servus me pulsavit". Postea dixit hic illi: "Considerabo". Post ille convicium fecit et magis magisque praesente multis clamavit". Frivulus hic quidem iam et inliberalis est sermo; non enim est adeptus id, quod habet adtenuata figura, puris et electis verbis compositam orationem"* (4, 16).

<sup>64</sup> B. Spillner: op. cit. 26–8.

<sup>65</sup> *Elocutio est idoneorum verborum et sententiarum ad inventionem adcommodatio* (1, 3).

<sup>66</sup> Cf. G. Morpurgo-Tagliabue: *La stilistica di Aristotele e lo strutturalismo*. *Lingua e stile II* (1967), 1–18. Cf. also: A. Kibédi Varga: *Rhétorique et littérature*. *Études de structures classiques*. Paris, 1970. 127–38.